

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-33 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 24, and 30 have been amended. New claims 34-40 have been added. Claims 11 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-10, 12-27, and 29-40 remain pending.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on July 18, 2007. Per the Examiner of the current application (Examiner Phan), Supervisory Patent Examiner Chi Pham had permitted Examiner Phan to conduct the interview with Representative of Applicants in his absence. During the interview, claim 1 and the reference, Strasser et al (U.S. 2003/0185238), were discussed. No agreement was reached.

DRAWINGS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because all blocks in Figures 6A-6B should be labeled with descriptive legends based on 37 C.F.R. § 1.184(o). Accordingly, Applicants have amended Figures 6A-6B to overcome the objection. A copy of the amended drawings is submitted with the current response. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 11 and 28 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310

base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 11 and 28 depend directly from claims 7 and 24, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants have canceled claims 11 and 28 and amended their respective base claims, i.e., claims 7 and 24, respectively, to include all of the limitations of claims 11 and 28, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments have overcome the objection and claims 7 and 24 as amended are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Strasser et al (U.S. 2003/0185238). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7 and 24 are not anticipated by Strasser for at least the reason discussed above. Claims 8, 10, 12, 25, 27, and 29 depend from claims 7 and 24, respectively, and thus, are not anticipated by Strasser. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth:

time-stamping *a lead packet* in each of a plurality of chunks, each of the plurality of chunks comprising the lead packet and a plurality of packets, *the lead packet comprising a program clock reference (PCR) packet*,
(Claim 1 as amended; emphasis added)

In contrast, Strasser fails to disclose at least the above limitation. According to Strasser, every transport packet related to SPTS is provided a separate timestamp (Strasser, paragraph [0022]). Timestamps are generated for individual transport packets related to a single program (Strasser, paragraph [0023]). Unlike Strasser, the current invention as claimed time-stamps *a lead packet* in each chunk and the lead packet comprising a PCR packet. Therefore, Strasser fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from claim 1 as amended, and thus, include all limitations set forth in claim 1. Thus, claims 2-3 and 5-6 are not anticipated by Strasser for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 as amended sets forth:

parsing a lead packet of each of the plurality of chunks to extract the temporal information of the lead packet within the second partial transport stream, wherein the temporal information includes the *chunk length* of the chunk associated with the lead packet, ...

(Claim 13 as amended; emphasis added)

In contrast, Strasser fails to disclose at least the above limitation. Strasser does not disclose temporal information including the chunk length of the chunk associated with the lead packet. For at least this reason, Strasser fails to anticipate claim 13 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 13, claims 16, 19, and 30 as amended are not anticipated by Strasser. Claims 14, 17, 20, 22-23, 31, and 33 depend from claims 13, 16, 19, and 30, respectively, and thus, are not anticipated by Strasser. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 15, 18, 21, 26 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasser et al (U.S. 2003/0185238) in view of Demas et al, (U.S. 2003/0165196). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and thus, includes all limitations set forth in claim 1. For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Strasser fails to disclose all limitations in claim 1 as amended. Furthermore, Demas fails to make up the deficiencies of Strasser. Demas discloses setting a PCR discontinuity bit in the transport packet header (Demas, paragraph [0028]). Demas fails to disclose time-stamping only a lead packet of each of a plurality of chunks. Since Strasser and Demas, alone or in combination, fail to disclose every limitation of

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310

claim 4, claim 4 is patentable over Strasser in view of Demas. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 15, 18, 21, 26, and 32, depend from claims 7, 13, 16, 19, 24, and 30, respectively, and thus, include all limitations set forth in their respective base claims. For the reason discussed above, Strasser fails to disclose temporal information including the chunk length of the chunk associated with the lead packet. Furthermore, Demas fails to make up the deficiencies of Strasser. Demas discloses setting a PCR discontinuity bit in the transport packet header (Demas, paragraph [0028]). Demas fails to disclose temporal information including the chunk length of the chunk associated with the lead packet. Since Strasser and Demas, alone or in combination, fail to disclose every limitation of claims 9, 15, 18, 21, 26, and 32, claims 9, 15, 18, 21, 26, and 32 are patentable over Strasser in view of Demas. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 34-40 have been added without introducing any new matter. Claim 34 sets forth:

parsing a lead packet of each of the plurality of chunks to extract temporal information and a *chunk length* of a respective chunk from the lead packet; and
(Claim 34; emphasis added)

For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 13, the art of record does not disclose at least the above limitation. Therefore, new claim 34 is allowable and such action is earnestly solicited.

New claims 35-36 depend from claim 34, and thus, are also allowable for the above reason. Allowance of claims 35-36 is earnestly solicited.

New claim 37 sets forth:

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310

a processor coupled to the storage medium operable to dynamically select a timestamp-per-packet mode or a timestamp-per-chunk mode to reconstruct a video stream, wherein, if the timestamp-per-chunk mode is selected, the processor is operable to retrieve a plurality of chunks from the storage device, each of the plurality of chunks including a lead packet and a plurality of packets, the processor is further operable to parse the lead packet of each of the plurality of chunks to extract temporal information and a *chunk length* of a respective chunk, and to reconstruct a video stream using the plurality of chunks, the temporal information, and the chunk length.

(Claim 37; emphasis added)

For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 13, the art of record does not disclose at least the above limitation. Therefore, new claim 37 is allowable and such action is earnestly solicited.

New claims 38-40 depend from claim 37, and thus, are also allowable for the above reason. Allowance of claims 38-40 is earnestly solicited.

Attorney Docket No. 3551.P052

Patent
10/608,310

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections and the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these objections and rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Date: July 25, 2007

By: CTW

Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300